JS 44 (Rev. 07/16)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose or mining				V					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS KARINA AVESIAN				DEFENDANTS MIDLAND FUNDING LLC MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC.					
KARIINA AVESIAIN				MISEANS GREST III. IIV. (SEINELVI, IV.					
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Montgomery (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name,)	Address and Tolombone Number			Attorneys (If Known)					
Joséph M. Adams, Esq. Law Office of Joseph M.	Adams			Tatomeys (IJ Known)					
200 Highpoint Dr, Ste 21 II. BASIS OF JURISDI				TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in (One Box j	for Plaintiff
□ 1 U.S. Government 3 Federal Question				(For Diversity Cases Only) P1	F DEF		and One Box for	r Defende PTF	ant) DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government	Not a Party)	Citize	en of This State		Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		J 4	1 4
Defendant Defendant		Citize	Citizen of Another State					□ 5	
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 🗆 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) DRTS	F	ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BAN	KRUPTCY	OTHER S	STATUT	ES
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY		25 Drug Related Seizure	☐ 422 Appe	al 28 USC 158	☐ 375 False Cl		
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	ne 🗆 310 Airplane 🗆 36.		□ 69	of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157		☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a))		
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	Product Liability 367 Health Care/		o omer	15000.050	200	☐ 400 State Re	apportion	ament
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury			□ 820 Copy	rights	☐ 410 Antitrus ☐ 430 Banks a		ng
☐ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Product Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal	a)		☐ 830 Paten ☐ 840 Trade		ark 450 Commerce		
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	Injury Product					☐ 470 Rackete	er Influer	
(Excludes Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	TY 0 71	LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL 861 HIA (SECURITY (1395ff)	Corrupt 480 Consum	Organiza er Credit	
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle	☐ 370 Other Fraud		Act	☐ 862 Black	Lung (923)	☐ 490 Cable/Sa		- 4141 /
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 380 Other Personal	D 72	20 Labor/Management Relations	☐ 863 DIWC	C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI	☐ 850 Securitie Exchang		odities/
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal Injury	Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage		10 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	■ 890 Other St ■ 891 Agricult		
☐ 196 Franchise	362 Personal Injury -	Product Liability		Leave Act			☐ 893 Environ	mental M	latters
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITION		00 Other Labor Litigation 01 Employee Retirement	FEDERA	AL TAX SUITS	☐ 895 Freedom Act	of Inton	mation
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:		Income Security Act	☐ 870 Taxes	(U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 896 Arbitrati		1
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment	☐ 463 Alien Detainee ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate			or De □ 871 IRS—	efendant) -Third Party	☐ 899 Adminis Act/Rev	iew or Ap	
☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 443 Housing/	Sentence			26 U	SC 7609	Agency . 950 Constitu	Decision	
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty		IMMIGRATION			State Sta		OI .
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Other		52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration					
	Other	☐ 550 Civil Rights	.	Actions					
	☐ 448 Education	☐ 555 Prison Condition ☐ 560 Civil Detainee -							
		Conditions of Confinement							
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)	Commentent							
X 1 Original □ 2 Re		Remanded from Appellate Court		estated or 5 Transfe pened Anothe (specify)	r District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	•	Multidis Litigatio Direct F	on -
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	47 U.S.C. Section	n 227, et seq.	re filing (I	Do not cite jurisdictional stat		versity):			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIV		_{luse:} autodialer to Plaintif	ff's cell r	ohone in violation of	the Teleph	one Consume	er Protection	Act	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.				EMAND S	CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: ✓ Yes ✓ No				
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S)								
IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE	BODNIE 18	DE BECORD	DOCKE	T NUMBER			
DATE 02/13/2017		SIGNATURE OF AT	CH	OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY									
RECEIPT # AM	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUI	OGE		

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

:

KARINA AVESIAN

(Civ. 660) 10/02

CIVIL ACTION

215-996-9977 Telephone	215-996-9111 FAX Number	josephmadamsesq@verizon.net E-Mail Address				
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for Pla	intiff			
<u>February 13, 2017</u>	Joseph Will	Joseph M. Adams, Esc				
(f) Standard Management - Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.						
commonly referred to as comp	hat do not fall into tracks (a) throug lex and that need special or intense this form for a detailed explanation	management by	()			
(d) Asbestos - Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.						
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()						
and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.						
(b) Social Security - Cases request	ting review of a decision of the Sec	retary of Health				
a) Habeas Corpus - Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLO	WING CASE MANAGEMENT T	RACKS:				
plaintiff shall complete a Case Ma filing the complaint and serve a cop side of this form.) In the event the designation, that defendant shall, we	ice Expense and Delay Reduction magement Track Designation Form by on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of hat a defendant does not agree with its first appearance, submit to the ase Management Track Designation case should be assigned.	in all civil cases at the table the plan set forth on the the the plaintiff regarding clerk of court and serve	time of reverse ng said e on the			
MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC, et a	al. : : :	NO.				
v.	: :					

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. Address of Plaintiff: c/o Law Office of Joseph M. Adams, 200 Highpoint Drive, Suite 211A, Chalfont, PA 18914 Address of Defendant: 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Sulte 1300, San Diego, California 92108 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: MONTGOMERY COUNTY, PA (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? Yes□ No□ (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Date Terminated: Judge Case Number: __ Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? Yes□ 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? CIVIL: (Place / in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: A. Federal Question Cases: 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 1.

Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 2.

Airplane Personal Injury 2. D FELA 3.

Assault, Defamation 3. Dones Act-Personal Injury ■ Marine Personal Injury 4.

Antitrust 5.

Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 5. Patent 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 6.

Labor-Management Relations 7. D Products Liability 7. D Civil Rights 8. Products Liability - Asbestos 8.

Habeas Corpus 9. □ All other Diversity Cases 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases (Please specify) 10. □ Social Security Review Cases All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 47 U.S.C. Section 227, et seq ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) , counsel of record do hereby certify: L Joseph M. Adams, Esq. □ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. DATE: February 13, 2017 Attorney I.D.# Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above. 58430 DATE: February 13, 2017 Attorney I.D.# Attorney-at-Law

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

KARINA AVESIAN, :

an individual,

Plaintiff, CIVIL ACTION

v. : No.:

MIDLAND FUNDING LLC, :

a foreign limited liability company,

and MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC., :

a foreign for-profit corporation,

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW, Plaintiff, KARINA AVESIAN, (hereinafter, "Plaintiff"), by and through the undersigned counsel, and hereby sues Defendants, MIDLAND FUNDING LLC (hereinafter, "MF") and MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC. (hereinafter, "MCM") (hereinafter collectively, "Defendants"). In support thereof, Plaintiff states:

INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This is an action for damages brought by an individual consumer for Defendants' violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 United States Code, Section 227 (hereinafter, the "TCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 47 United States Code, Section 227(b)(3) and
 United States Code, Section 1337.
- 2. Venue in this District is proper because Defendants transact business in this District and the conduct complained of occurred in this District.

- 3. At all material times herein, Plaintiff is an individual residing in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.
- 4. At all material times herein, MF is a foreign limited liability company existing under the laws of the state of Delaware and engaged in business in Pennsylvania, with its principal place of business located at 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 1300, San Diego, California 92108, that, itself and through its subsidiaries, regularly purchases and collects defaulted consumer debts from residents in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 5. At all material times herein, MCM is a foreign for-profit corporation existing under the laws of the state of Kansas and engaged in business in Pennsylvania, with its principal place of business located at 3111 Camino Del Rio North, Suite 1300, San Diego, California 92108, that, itself and through its subsidiaries, regularly collects defaulted consumer debts owed or asserted to be owed to MF from residents in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 6. At all material times herein, Defendants act themselves or through their agents, employees, officers, members, directors, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, third-party vendors, and insurers.
- 7. Upon information and belief, MF purchased debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff after such debt entered default.
 - 8. Upon information and belief, MF assigned Plaintiff's debt to MCM for collection.
- 9. At all material times herein, MCM acted on MF's behalf, and with MF's knowledge, consent, and approval when MCM made telephone calls to Plaintiff in its attempts to collect the debt.
- 10. All necessary conditions precedent to the filing of this action occurred or Defendants waived.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. MCM made telephone calls, as more specifically alleged below, to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number 484.XXX.2642, using an automatic telephone dialing system (hereinafter, "ATDS"), a predictive telephone dialing system (hereinafter, "PTDS"), or an artificial or pre-recorded voice (hereinafter, "APV").
- 12. At all material times herein, Plaintiff is the owner, regular user, and possessor of a Cellular Telephone with assigned number 484.XXX.2642 (hereinafter, "Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone").
- 13. At no time herein did Defendants possess prior express consent to call Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV.
- 14. At no time herein did Defendant possess prior express consent to call Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone as Plaintiff obtained Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone number after MF acquired the debt it attempted to collect from Plaintiff.
- 15. Additionally, if Defendants contend they made the below-referenced phone calls for "informational purposes only," they nevertheless lacked the required prior express written consent necessary to place such informational calls to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV.
- 16. MCM made each call to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephones on MF's behalf, and with MF's consent, knowledge, and approval.
- 17. Despite lacking prior express consent, from approximately July 2015 through June 2016, Defendants made approximately three (3) calls every day to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV.
- 18. As of September 1, 2016, the Plaintiff retained Leavengood, Dauval, Boyle & Meyer, P.A. and the Law Office of Joseph M. Adams (hereinafter collectively "Undersigned

Counsel") for representation with respect to her TCPA claims against Defendants.

- 19. Plaintiff retained Undersigned Counsel for the purpose of pursuing this matter against Defendants, and Plaintiff is obligated to pay her attorneys a reasonable fee for their services.
- 20. Plaintiff has not been able, due to both professional and/or personal commitments, as well as the continued and increasing stress associated with the continued barrage of autodialed telephone calls, to record the specifics on each and every call made to Plaintiff by Defendants. Plaintiff asserts, however, that the above-referenced calls are but a subset and general description of the total calls she is aware of and that each caused emotional distress, anxiety, and inability to use her Cellular Telephone when Defendants made such calls, all made in violation of the TCPA. Moreover, Defendants are in the best position to determine and ascertain the number and methodology of calls made to Plaintiff.
- 21. United States Code, Title 47, Section 227(b)(3) provides for the award of \$500.00 or actual damages, whichever is greater, for each telephone call made to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using any ATDS, PTDS, or APV to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone in violation of the TCPA or the regulations prescribed thereunder.
- 22. Additionally, the TCPA, Section 227(b)(3) allows the trial court to increase the damages up to three times, or \$1,500.00, for each telephone call made to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using any ATDS, PTDS, or APV to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone in willful or knowing violation of the TCPA or the regulations prescribed thereunder.

COUNT ONE: TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACTVIOLATION OF 47 UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 227(b)(1)(A)

Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs one (1) through twenty-two (22) as if fully restated herein and further states as follows:

- 23. Defendants are both subject to, and each violated the provisions of, 47 United States Code, Section 227 (b)(1)(A) by using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV to call a telephone number assigned to a cellular telephone service without Plaintiff's prior express consent.
- 24. At no time herein did Defendants possess consent to call Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone using an ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV.
- 25. Despite lacking Plaintiff's prior express consent, MCM, on MF's behalf—and with MF's consent, knowledge, and approval—used and ATDS, a PTDS, or an APV to make calls to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone *at least* three (3) times a day from approximately July 2015 through June 2016.
- 26. The phone calls MCM made to Plaintiff on MF's behalf—and with MF's consent, knowledge, and approval—are the result of a repeated willful and knowing violation of the TCPA.
 - 27. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff suffered:
 - a. The periodic loss of her cellular telephone service;
 - b. Lost material costs associated with the use of peak time cellular telephone minutes allotted under her cellular telephone service contract; and
 - c. Emotional distress, anxiety, loss of sleep, and deterioration of relationships, both personal and professional, as a result of the repeated willful and knowing calls placed in violation of the TCPA.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, as a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff respectfully requests entry of:

- a. Judgment against Defendants declaring that Defendants violated the TCPA;
- b. Judgment enjoining Defendants from making further autodialed phone calls to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephone;

c. Judgment for each of the Plaintiff against Defendants awarding the greater of actual damages or statutory damages in the amount of \$500.00 for each of Defendants' telephone calls to Plaintiff's Cellular Telephones in violation of the TCPA;

d. Judgment for each of the Plaintiff against Defendants awarding treble damages in the amount of an additional \$1,000.00 for each telephone call made to the Plaintiff's Cellular Telephones in violation of the TCPA where Defendants acted knowingly and/or willfully; and

e. Any other such relief the Court may deem proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues triable by right.

SPOLIATION NOTICE AND DEMAND TO RETAIN EVIDENCE

Plaintiff hereby gives notice to Defendants and demand that Defendants and their affiliates safeguard all relevant evidence—paper, electronic documents, or data—pertaining to this litigation as required by law.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joseph M. Adams, Esq., PBN 58430

engh The

Law Office of Joseph M. Adams 200 Highpoint Drive, Suite 211A

Chalfont, PA 18914 Phone: (215) 996-9977 Fax: (215) 996-9111

josephmadamsesq@verizon.net

and

Ian R. Leavengood, Esq., FBN 0010167 Aaron M. Swift, Esq., FBN 093088 Gregory H. Lercher, Esq., FBN 0106991 Sara J. Weiss, Esq., FBN 0115637 LeavenLaw, P.A.

Northeast Professional Center

3900 First Street North, Suite 100 St. Petersburg, FL 33703 Phone: (727) 327-3328 Fax: (727) 327-3305 consumerservice@leavenlaw.com aswift@leavenlaw.com glercher@leavenlaw.com sweiss@leavenlaw.com pro hac vice application forthcoming Attorneys for Plaintiff